

1 *E-filed on* 5/30/06

2  
3  
4  
5  
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
8 SAN JOSE DIVISION  
9

10 IN RE CYGNUS TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
11 TECHNOLOGY, LLC, PATENT  
12 LITIGATION

No. MDL-1423

C-04-01791  
C-03-03594

13 This order relates to:

ORDER GRANTING DEFAULT  
JUDGMENT

14 CYGNUS TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
15 TECHNOLOGY, LLC,

**[Re Docket Nos. 14, 18, 27, 30, 31 in Case No.  
04-01791; 86 in Case No. 03-03594]**

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 ACCESS NETWORK SERVICES,

19 Defendant.

20 and

21 CYGNUS TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
22 TECHNOLOGY, LLC,

23 Plaintiff,

24 v.

25 VOICEWARE SYSTEMS CORPORATION;  
26 THE TELEPHONE CONNECTION OF LOS  
27 ANGELES; TELCAN INCORPORATION;  
28 ANDREW KAWESKI; ALLIANCE  
CALLBACK COMMUNICATIONS; ACCESS  
NETWORK SERVICES; INTERACTIVE  
MEDIA TECHNOLOGIES, INC;

Defendants.

1 Plaintiff Cygnus Telecommunications Technology, LLC moves for a default judgment  
2 against defendant Access Network Services. For the reasons given below, the court will largely  
3 grant Cygnus the relief it seeks.

#### 4 **I. DEFAULT JUDGMENT AGAINST ACCESS NETWORK**

5 Cygnus filed a patent infringement suit involving U.S. Patent Nos. 5,883,964 and 6,035,027  
6 against Access Network in late 2003. Cygnus alleges that Access Network uses and offers for sale  
7 Cygnus's patented inventions in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a). Access Network has yet to appear  
8 in the action, and the clerk entered Access Network's default on August 4, 2004. Dkt. no. 6, Case  
9 No. 04-01791. On November 29, 2005, the court ordered Access Networks to provide to Cygnus by  
10 January 13, 2006 information for an accounting.<sup>1</sup> Cygnus's initially sought only monetary damages  
11 from Access Network, but then decided to pursue injunctive relief, as well.

#### 12 **A. Damages**

13 Cygnus presents evidence which it claims shows Access Network's liability to Cygnus:  
14 According to the Access Network website, "Ezcor Direct" is the "invoicing entity" for Access  
15 Network. *See* Sutton Decl.,<sup>2</sup> Ex. 105 at 7, Case No. 04-01791. On February 28, 2003, Ezcor Direct,  
16 Inc. and the GlobalTel Division of InterActive Media Technologies Inc.<sup>3</sup> entered into a contract  
17 whereby the former transferred its "customer base and switching capabilities" in "international call-  
18 back" to, and became a marketing agent of, the latter. *Id.*, Ex. 245 at 1, 4. Between April 11, 2003  
19 and December 5, 2005, "IMT paid Access Network Services on behalf of Ezcor Direct, Inc."  
20 commissions totaling \$293,293.18.<sup>4</sup> *See* Sutton Decl., ¶ 6-7, Ex. 246 at 1, Ex. 247 at 1. These  
21 thirty-four monthly payments average \$8,626.27 per month.

---

22  
23 <sup>1</sup> The court grants Cygnus's request, *see* dkt. no. 18 in Case No. 04-01791, for thirty more days to  
24 provide this information.

25 <sup>2</sup> John Sutton has filed numerous declarations. All references in this order to a Sutton declaration  
26 are to the February 17, 2006 "Declaration of Sutton in Support of Motion for Money Judgment,"  
27 docket entry no. 28 in Case No. 04-01791.

28 <sup>3</sup> This entity appears to be referred to as "IMT" by its own counsel, but "GlobalTel" by Cygnus and  
the entity itself. *Compare* Sutton Decl., Ex. 246 at 1 *with id.* ¶ 6, Ex. 245 at 1.

<sup>4</sup> Cygnus incorrectly determined the sum of the commissions to be \$292,837.61. *Compare* Mot. at 2  
*with* Sutton Decl., Ex. 247 at 1.

1 Cygnus seeks to recover not only for the period of April 2003 to December 2005, but also  
 2 January and February 2006. Cygnus has produced no evidence whatsoever that Access Networks  
 3 received any commissions for those two months. Cygnus merely asks the court to "assume similar  
 4 revenue" at the same average monthly rate as for April 2003 to December 2005. Mot. at 2 (dkt.  
 5 no. 27), Case No. 04-01791. This the court cannot do without some proof.

6 The GlobalTel-Access Network contract states that GlobalTel will pay Access Network an  
 7 8.5 percent commission on sales. Sutton Decl., Ex. 245 at 5. An 8.5 percent commission of  
 8 \$293,293.18 indicates total sales of \$3,450,508.<sup>5</sup>

9 Cygnus seeks a 4 percent royalty as damages against Access Network. Mot. at 3. This court  
 10 has previously determined in another uncontested hearing that 4 percent of a defendant's gross  
 11 revenues is a reasonable royalty for use of Cygnus's patents. *Cygnus Telecomms. Tech. v. Call*  
 12 *Point*, No. 03-00876 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 19, 2003) (order granting plaintiff damages in connection with  
 13 default judgment); *see also* 35 U.S.C. § 284 (damages for patent infringement shall not be "less than  
 14 a reasonable royalty for the use made of the invention by the infringer"). Four percent of \$3,450,508  
 15 is \$138,020.32, and the court will award Cygnus this amount in damages.

16 Cygnus's complaint did not state any amount of damages, Compl. ¶ 7 ("The amount of  
 17 money damages is not presently known."), Case No. 04-01791, and the relief prayed for included  
 18 "[d]amages adequate to compensate for the infringement," *id.* at 3. A default judgment cannot  
 19 exceed the amount sought in the complaint. *SEC v. Wencke*, 577 F.2d 619, 623 (9th Cir. 1978)  
 20 (Fed.R.Civ.P. 54(c) does not allow court to award relief "beyond that requested in the complaint.").  
 21 However, the Ninth Circuit allowed a default judgment on a complaint containing a demand for a  
 22 stated sum plus "amounts of which Plaintiff will prove at the time of trial" to exceed the stated sum.  
 23 *Henry v. Sneiders*, 490 F.2d 315, 317 (9th Cir. 1974); *but see Fong v. United States*, 300 F.2d 400,  
 24 412 (9th Cir. 1962) ("Since the prayer limits the relief granted in a judgment by default, the prayer  
 25 must be sufficiently specific that the court can follow the mandate of the Rule."). Under *Henry*,  
 26 Cygnus's prayer for relief appears sufficient for this court to award Cygnus \$138,020.32 as a  
 27 reasonable royalty for Access Network's infringement.

28 

---

<sup>5</sup> \$293,293.18 ÷ 8.5% = \$3,450,508.

1 Cygnus seeks to limit judgment to "infringement by GlobalTel and Access acting jointly."  
2 Mot. at 3. Though Cygnus states that GlobalTel and Access Network are jointly and severally liable  
3 on the damages at issue in this case, GlobalTel is not a defendant in Case No. 04-01791, the action  
4 in which Cygnus has filed for default against Access Network. Nothing in this order should be  
5 construed as determinative of any liability GlobalTel may have to Cygnus or Access Network.

6 The court will enter judgment for Cygnus against Access Network in the amount of  
7 \$138,020.32.

## 8 **B. Injunction**

9 A permanent injunction should issue in patent cases based on "traditional equitable  
10 principles." *eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C.*, 126 S. Ct. 1837, 1840 (2006). The court is satisfied  
11 that Cygnus has shown by default "(1) that it has suffered an irreparable injury; (2) that remedies  
12 available at law, such as monetary damages, are inadequate to compensate for that injury; (3) that,  
13 considering the balance of hardships between the plaintiff and defendant, a remedy in equity is  
14 warranted; and (4) that the public interest would not be disserved by a permanent injunction" against  
15 Access Network infringing Cygnus's patents. *See id.* at 1839. The court will grant Cygnus's request  
16 for a permanent injunction against Access Network.

## 17 **II. PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AGAINST GLOBALTEL**

18 Cygnus seeks a preliminary injunction against GlobalTel. The only case in which GlobalTel  
19 is a defendant, Case No. 03-03594, was stayed when Cygnus made this motion. It would be unjust  
20 in the posture of these cases to base a preliminary injunction against GlobalTel on a default  
21 judgment against Access Network. GlobalTel is a defendant and active participant in a different  
22 case than the one against Access Network. Cygnus's motion for a preliminary injunction against  
23 GlobalTel is denied without prejudice.

24 GlobalTel, though, does not object to Cygnus's request that GlobalTel pay any money due  
25 Access Network to Cygnus instead. The court will grant this request as a reasonable extension of  
26 the injunction against Access Network.

**III. ORDER**

For the reasons given above, the court

- (1) awards Cygnus \$138,020.32 as a reasonable royalty for Access Network's infringement through December 2005;
- (2) permanently enjoins Access Network and its officers, agents, employees, and those acting in concert with it from infringing U.S. Patent Nos. 5,883,964 and 6,035,027;
- (3) orders GlobalTel to pay any monies it would otherwise owe Access Network to Cygnus as they come due; and
- (4) denies Cygnus's motion for a preliminary injunction against GlobalTel without prejudice.

DATED: 5/30/06



RONALD M. WHYTE  
United States District Judge

1 A copy of this order was mailed on \_\_\_\_\_ to:

2 **Counsel for Plaintiff:**

3 John Paul Sutton  
2421 Pierce Street  
4 San Francisco, CA 94115-1131

5 Robert Charles Kain, Jr.  
Fleit Kain Gibbons Gutman & Bongini  
6 750 SE 3rd Avenue  
Suite 100  
7 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316

8 **Counsel for Defendants:**

Kieran Patrick Fallon  
9 436 SW 8th Street  
Miami, FL 33130-2814

10 John F. Mardula; Jon L. Roberts  
11 Roberts Abokhair Mardula, LLC  
11800 Sunrise Valley Drive  
12 Suite 1000  
Reston, VA 20191-5302

13 **Courtesy Copy:**

14 Clerk of the Panel  
15 Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation  
Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building  
16 One Columbus Circle, N.E.  
Room G-255, North Lobby  
17 Washington, D.C. 20002-8004

18 Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this order to co-counsel, as necessary.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28